DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 271 HE 009 177

AUTHOR Spurlin, M. D.; Bezzi, D. R.
TITLE A Cooperative Accreditation Team Visit: Metropolitan State College: Denver, Colorado: 1976.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); *Certification; *Higher Education; Planning; State Agencies; *State Colleges; State Departments of Education; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ; *North Central Association

ABSTRACT

Metropolitan State College accomplished a unique accreditation procedure in 1976; that of several accrediting agencies conducting a simultaneous and cooperative visit. The agencies were the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the North Central Association (NCA), and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Each agency provided several visitation members who were pooled to comprise the joint team. The experiment was conducted to accomplish the accreditation more efficiently and effectively. The report outlines the planning phase for the joint visit, the basic agreements among the agencies and with the college, the process of developing the college's self-study required by each of the agencies, the details of the visit itself, as well as the analysis of the team's reporting procedure and the costs and benefits of the joint venture. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143271

INTRODUCTION

Metropolitan State College recently accomplished a unique accreditation procedure; that of several accrediting agencies conducting a simultaneous and cooperative visit. The agencies were: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the North Central Association (NCA), and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Each agency provided several visitation members who were pooled to comprise the joint team. Other accrediting agencies on campus during the visitation week of March 2-5, 1976, were the National League for Nursing, the National Association of Schools of Music, and the Engineering Council for Professional Development.

HE009177

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COOPERATIVE ACCREDITATION TEAM VISIT:

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE: DENVER, COLORADO: 1976

by M. D. Spurlin and D. R. Bezzi

The College - An Overview

Metropolitan State College (MSC) is one of five institutions in the Colorado state college system. The legislation authorizing the college was passed in 1963; funds for its opening were appropriated two years later. MSC is a vigorous growing institution located in a large urban center, Denver, Colorado. The legislative direction given the college was:

1. To provide undergraduate programs of instruction in liberal arts and sciences.
2. To provide undergraduate programs of instruction in science or engineering technology on a terminal basis.
3. To encourage cooperation with other state institutions of higher education.
4. To serve the needs for higher education in the Denver metropolitan area.

The first classes were offered during the fall quarter of 1965 with a total enrollment of 1,189 students. During the ten year period from fall 1965 to fall 1975 the growth was phenomenal - the enrollment during the 1975 fall quarter increased to 12,651 students. Academic programs are offered in the areas of business, education, engineering technology, liberal arts, science and mathematics, professional studies and urban affairs.

The college has operated for the past ten years in downtown leased building facilities and will be moving during December, 1976, to a permanent campus, also in the immediate downtown area. This facility is to be shared by three public supported institutions of higher education:

Community College of Denver, a two-year degree granting institution; Metropolitan State College, a four-year degree granting college; and the University of Colorado at Denver, primarily a graduate degree granting institution, but with some limited undergraduate programs as well. Space and facilities are largely to be shared by the three institutions, but each is to remain a separate entity.

Accreditation - Birth of the Concept

Three accrediting agencies were scheduled to visit the college for re-accreditation during early 1976, and program directors were considering seeking initial accreditation in six additional areas. The idea of a joint accreditation visit began during the early part of 1974. At this time questions were raised as to how the accreditation process might be done more effectively and efficiently. Several contributing reasons were discussed that supported the concept of combining some of the efforts and visits.

1. Many of the preparations to be made were essentially the same for each of the several accrediting agencies. It therefore seemed desirable to concentrate the efforts of the entire college towards this preparation and provide focus upon the process for all.
2. Each self-study called for many common college-wide data. Why not have a single report containing these materials and do the task carefully and accurately only one time?
3. A single all-out effort involving everyone in the process seemed appropriate. Each was to be given a role in both the seeking and receipt of accreditation. What better way is there to gain both involvement and quality than through a means where the consequences affect that person?

Feasibility and Planning

The feasibility of such a plan of accreditation was enhanced by a set of supporting circumstances. The initial accreditations which had been granted in 1971 by the North Central Association, by NCATE and by the Colorado State Department of Education were received at nearly the same time, so few adjustments were necessary to make the renewal dates common. The suggested plan received the support of the president of the institution for an ongoing feasibility study and possible implementation. After further discussion, the faculty, staff and administration were supportive of the concept.

The next step was to contact the appropriate accrediting agencies to investigate the possibility of their participation in a joint visitation venture. Initial contacts were made through letters to officers of the agencies. Fortunately, the individuals who had arranged for the initial visits at the college five years earlier were still on the respective executive staffs of each of the agencies and were therefore familiar with the college and its programs.

As discussion progressed as to which agencies might be scheduled for a simultaneous visit, the list grew longer and longer. The first and obvious ones were the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). Each had been on campus before, each was familiar with the operation of the institution and each had granted the initial five-year accreditation on the first visit. In addition, interest was espoused in seeking initial accreditation from: The National League of Nurses (NLN), Colorado State Board of Nursing (CSBN), the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), American Assemblage

of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Council on Social Worker Education (CSWE) and the Engineering Council for Professional Development (ECPD). These too, were added to the list for consideration. After widespread discussion, it was decided the focus for a joint team effort should be concentrated on those who had been on campus before. However, all other agencies would be invited to be on campus during the same period so they might share in the total accreditation venture and in any exchange of information they wished. All visits were scheduled for March 2-5 or as near that time as possible so the common self-study would be usable by all.

During July of 1974, representatives of this institution met jointly with Dr. Bernard Rezabek, Associate Director of NCATE, and Dr. Otto Ruff, Supervisor of Teacher Education and Certification for the Colorado Department of Education, to explore the possibility of such a joint visit in greater depth. At this meeting discussion centered around team representation and composition, the format of the self-study report and other general guidelines. Consensus and tentative approval was reached so further planning could progress. Dr. Joseph Barney, representing the North Central Association, also concurred with the plans through mail contacts. IT WAS AT THIS POINT THE DECISION WAS CONFIRMED TO PROCEED WITH THE JOINT TEAM VISITATION.

The next several months involved on-campus development of specific plans for the self-study report, including committee composition and chapter outline construction. A meeting with the NCA and NCATE executive officers, mentioned earlier, was held in Chicago to confirm agreements and discuss the progress being made. A comparison of specific standards of the three agencies was provided and discussed. Team balance and composition by area

of expertise was finalized. The meeting concluded with a reaffirmed commitment to the project, which was the first joint effort of this type in which the North Central Association had participated. Firm dates were established for the visitation and the first work was begun in the team selection by the respective agencies.

Underlying Agreements

Several agreements were made which were of such significance that they should be stated for the reader, in the event similar cooperative projects are being considered. One of the most important was the willingness of the three agencies to accept a self-study with a common format, supplemented by program-specific appendices as needed.

A second item was the acceptance of the concept that a single team could be formed, consisting of at least five members from each accrediting segment, which could be relied upon to fulfill the specific needs of each agency. A composition was agreed upon to insure the breadth of expertise necessary from an accrediting team. It was decided that the North Central Association would provide personnel with expertise in or as: 1) college president, 2) finance, 3) vocational training, 4) and 5) professors from urban type institutions, one with a background in liberal arts and the second in administration. NCATE was asked to provide personnel with expertise in: 1) elementary education, 2) educational evaluation and research, 3) media, 4) and 5) two professors from schools of education located in metropolitan areas. The first was to have a background in educational administration and the second in elementary education. The Colorado Department of Education was asked to provide the following personnel: 1) Dean of a School of Education, 2) a secondary public school teacher, 3) a local

Professor of education, 4) a member of the State Department of Education Teacher Certification Office, and 5) an assistant superintendent of a Colorado public school district. These fifteen individuals comprised the team which visited the institution.

A third agreement which was important to have established was the desirability for each accrediting group to provide a separate final report, since each felt the need to address specific items. (Although each group did provide a final report of their findings, much of the reported data was from a common source and in many instances common wording was used; a tribute to the trust that team members placed in one another.)

The team itself was to be chaired on a cooperative basis, each team having a representative who acted as a co-chairman, but with the regional accrediting agency representative responsible in the event of conflicts. Finally, it was considered essential that a simultaneous pre-visit by the chairmen occur approximately a month before the full team visitation. An essential ingredient was the absolute sharing of all correspondence from the onset so each chairman was fully informed of all proceedings.

The Self-Study

After thorough discussion with the three agencies, it was agreed that the general format which had been proposed by the North Central Association would be followed in providing the basic data about the institution. This was modified only slightly from that provided in the "Interim Evaluation Guide for Institutional Assessment" (October, 1973). The ordering of the chapters was changed to better accommodate the logic followed in the planning of the report. The chapter titles were:

Chapter 1 Institutional Objectives and Statement of Purposes
Chapter 2 The Dynamics of the Institution -- Decision Making and Planning

Chapter 3 Resources for Providing Educational Learning Experiences
Chapter 4 Educational and Learning Experiences
Chapter 5 Progress and Achievement Evaluation in Relation to Institutional Goals
Chapter 6 The Future and Auraria

The sixth chapter was added which dealt with the campus currently under construction. "Auraria" is the name of the higher education campus complex which is to be shared by the three institutions mentioned in the College Overview section.

During the late summer of 1974 a steering committee was formed to provide general direction and review for the development of the common self-study to be used for the visits. It was decided heavy faculty and student involvement was essential if the report were to be truly representative of the institution.

In order to be sure all personnel of the college were keenly aware of the upcoming accreditation visit and the need for participation, a media presentation was designed which explained the process of accreditation. The program was developed in cooperation with the instructional resources laboratory and featured cartoon characters to convey the message of accreditation. The series of slides examined accreditation in terms of need, process and team composition. The value of accreditation was described and emphasized for each of five groups: the faculty, administration, students, civil service employees, and for the public who support the institution with tax and tuition dollars. A chronology of events to occur was presented with emphasis upon each person's role during the actual visit. The presentation was the first item of business during the opening faculty and administrative meeting in the fall of 1975. It was repeated upon several other occasions so all

office and clerical employees viewed it, as did many students, who were given several similar opportunities. Special effort was made to enable student teachers and other students seeking certification to view it, since the teacher education offerings were specifically being examined.

Shortly after the fall opening, individual committees began meeting on a regular basis to develop the common report. Each committee was headed by a member of the steering committee and was composed of faculty members from all areas of the college, students, and college administrators. Each committee was composed of twelve to fourteen individuals and was assigned the task of developing one chapter of the six which would comprise the self-study report. One unique feature was the manner by which standards were referenced. When an NCATE standard was addressed by the main report, the specific standard numerical reference was placed in the margin, thus calling attention to the fact. A second item which the team reported to be of great help was an index which compared the CDE standards (NASDTEC) and the NCATE standards. See Appendix, page 15.

Faculty members in the Center for Education were assigned the responsibility of writing a section addressing NCATE and the Colorado Department of Education standards for the teacher education programs. This portion of the report was organized into five chapters which addressed both the NCATE and the Colorado Department of Education standards: The chapters were:

1. Curricula for Basic Programs
2. Faculty for Basic Programs
3. Students in Basic Programs
4. Resources and Facilities for the Basic Programs
5. Evaluation Program Review and Planning

A second volume addressed the standards for specific secondary programs for which certification is offered (art, history, biology, etc.). Each discipline section included the means by which specific requirements set forth by NASDTEC were met. The volume also included a section displaying summary résumés for each faculty member whose major responsibility included the preparation of prospective teachers.

It became apparent in the early formulation of chapter outlines that not all materials gathered were suitable for inclusion in the self-study report. It was decided these reference materials should be available for team reference, so a collection was made and an indexing system established. Included were items such as follow-up studies, enrollment data, faculty handbook, guidelines for the supervision of student teaching and other similar materials.

During the month preceding the visit, meetings were held with small groups of faculty from each school/center by the college President, Vice-President and the individual who coordinated the total college accreditation effort, Dr. Keats McKinney. These meetings were directed towards the specific role each faculty was to play during the visit. Lists of questions were prepared which might be asked concerning the teacher education program. The questions were designed to help the faculty member focus upon the role he or she plays in the program and how this relates to the total college effort. It also asked each to consider the students in the program in terms of performance and potential. The question of suitability and appropriateness of the content of each class was also addressed, not so much as a challenge to inclusion but more to sharpen and review the rationale for the course being structured as it is. This careful re-examination of one's own course, course objectives and approach was facilitated by the accreditation

process and considered to be one of its real benefits.

The Visit

Housing accommodations included a private room for each member along with group meeting rooms in the hotel which were available 24 hours a day. The institution also provided a suite of three adjoining conference rooms in the administration building which were available throughout the entire visit. It was within these rooms the reference files mentioned previously were housed. Typewriters and secretarial help were provided on an as needed basis, both in the college facilities and at the hotel.

If any one item had to be credited for making the visitation go smoothly once the team was on campus, it would have to be the meeting schedule which had been cooperatively prepared by members of the Colorado Department of Education and the college. This schedule included the time and place of each meeting, the topic or standards to be addressed, team members assigned the responsibility, and the contact person or persons representing the college. Any additional requests made by team members were placed within this schedule. See Appendix, page 16.

The North Central Association portion of the team concerned itself primarily with those aspects of the college which were broad in nature and scope, and affected all programs including the teacher education program. Some of these areas were general admission requirements, finance, physical facilities, and long range planning. This enabled the NCATE and CDE portions of the team to deal in greater depth with the details of the teacher education portion of the program.

On the evening of March 2, 1976, team members were greeted with a reception dinner prior to their first formal meeting. After the introductory dinner and reception, the team met in the hotel for a general orientation

meeting, at which time specific assignments for the following day were made. The next day, Wednesday, March 3 the team began visiting those areas for which each was responsible. The team met again that evening to discuss, exchange observations and write reports. The co-chairmen had met earlier in the day to assure coordination was going smoothly. The following morning the team chairmen again met to discuss findings before beginning that day's visits. These close and ongoing contacts were important in the continual emphasis upon cooperation and supplied an essential ingredient in the venture. Friday morning, March 4 was devoted mainly to team meetings, writing, and in the formulation of areas of consensus. The exit interview was scheduled for early afternoon, so if conflict areas arose, time for further discussion would be available. The President, Academic Vice-President, Dean for the Center for Education, a member of the Board of Trustees and two or three college representatives attended the exit interview. The team was represented by the three co-chairmen and two other team members.

The chairman from the North Central Association began the report and provided a one-page written summary of perceived strengths and weaknesses. He also indicated the team would recommend to the North Central Association, the granting of continued accreditation for a ten-year period.

The chairman of the NCATE segment reported next on the team findings that would be reported to the review board of NCATE concerning the college's teacher education program. He indicated this review board was responsible to recommend action by the council for the granting of accreditation. He also summarized the team report of strengths and weaknesses.

The final person to provide findings was the chairman of the state

department portion of the team. He, too, addressed the teacher program and indicated strengths and weaknesses which had been perceived by that portion of the team. He indicated the final determination would be made by a separate state agency, the State Board of Education, based upon findings and recommendations forwarded by the team.

The Visiting Team Reports

Given an appropriate writing time, the reports from NCATE, North Central and Colorado Department of Education were received for review and institutional reaction and response. These reports contained no real surprises, as the team had done an excellent job during the visit and in the exit interview. The sharing of information before the visit is over enables institutions to react, correct errors or to provide additional information before the team forms a conclusion which may not prove valid. This on-the-spot feedback is considered as a particular strength of the visit and is strongly encouraged to be followed by future visiting team members.

Costs and Benefits

The cost of the combined visit for the personnel composing the team was considerably less than that of three similar teams; however, the greatest conservation of resources was within the college itself. The writing of a single base report for the self-study was a particularly desirable benefit derived by the college, as its preparation involved a wide spectrum of individuals and special interest viewpoints focused upon a single goal.

Unexpected benefits were provided by the different perspectives that each team member brought from his home environment. The state team representatives brought the local situation into view and shared such things as the political

realities of education in Colorado today, recent impacting legislation which has affected teacher education programs, the effect of population change in the metropolitan area upon the college, and the budgetary process and limitations imposed by state and fiscal allocation agencies. These and other insights into the real world of education in Colorado were excellent aids to the entire team. Similarly, the NCATE and NCA components provided broad differing views of education and the education scene from the perspective of each member's home state, institutional and individual situation; thus the total team benefited greatly from one another's experiences.

It should be pointed out that certain risks are also taken as a possible consequence of the joint team approach. If the team should be composed of personnel who were unable to accept other member findings, could not relate well to one another, etc., the accreditation from the several agencies could be adversely affected. One cannot over-emphasize the "risk" factor this type of enterprise might have. If an institution were found wanting, one can clearly see the negative multiplier effect. The approach places many "eggs in one single basket" so should not be entered into without considerable thought and dedication to the project. A careful and thorough job of preparation for the visit is essential as is the total support of the institution personnel, from clerical through central administration. Provided the above conditions, a joint visit can be a rewarding experience. This is the way it was viewed and conducted at Metropolitan State College during the spring of 1976.

Not only were the preparations and process gratifying, the end result of continued accreditation was obtained.

Appendix Number 1

EDUCATION PROGRAM ACCREDITATION REFERENCES

Colorado State Department of Education

and

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

NASDEC		NCATE
2.0	I. Organization & Administration	1.5
2.1	A. Purpose/Objective	1.1
2.2	B. Organization	1.5
2.3	C. Adm/Ret/Follow-Up	3.1
2.4	D. Student Personnel	3.2
2.4.3	1. Advisement/Counseling	3.3
2.4.4	2. Teacher Supply/Demand	
2.4.5	3. Records	3.1
2.5	4. Student Involvement	3.4
2.6	E. Faculty	2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4
2.7	F. Facilities/Instr. Mat	4.3
2.7.1	1. Buildings/Grounds	
2.7.2	2. Library	4.1
2.7.3	3. Lab	4.2
2.7.5	4. Curr. Lab	4.2
	5. Teaching Aids	4.2
3.0	II. Curricula	
3.1, 3.2	A. General Teacher Ed.	1.2
3.3, 3.4	B. Prof. Sequences	1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4
3.5	1. Early Childhood	
3.5	2. Elementary Ed.	1.3.1
3.5	3. Secondary Ed.	1.3.1
	III. Changes	Intr., 5.3

Appendix Number 2

TEAM HEADQUARTERS:
Denver Marina Hotel
Timberline #2
1005 A And Forum Building

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE--COMMISSION VISIT SCHEDULE
March 2-5, 1976

Secretarial Service
Forum Bldg.-Room 804,
Ext. 373
Exhibit Material
Forum Bldg.-Room 1006B

TIME	TOPIC	TEAM MEMBERS	METRO CONTACT	PLACE OF APPOINTMENT
TUESDAY (3-2)				
5:30-7:45 pm	Dinner & Meeting with Dr. James D. Palmer, President, Metro State College	ALL MEMBERS ALL MEMBERS	NONE	Denver Athletic Club
8:00-9:00 pm	Team Orientation Meeting	ALL MEMBERS ALL MEMBERS	NONE	Denver Marina Hotel Timberline #2 *Timberline #1*
WEDNESDAY (3-3)				
8:00-9:00	Meeting with President Palmer	*Bezzi* Broderius	President Palmer	Forum 702
8:00-3:30	STUDENT FIELD EXPERIENCES 3.3 *1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4*	*Harper* Horton *Ferguson* Ohanian		Field
8:30-10:30	CURRICULUM 3.1 Curriculum Development, Planning *1.2* & Patterns 3.3 Professional Education & Elem.,Sec. *1.2.1, 1.3.3, 1.3.4*	*Harper* Adams *Aceto* Ruff *Ferguson*	Eugenia Berger George Brooke	TTT 103
9:00-10:30	ORGANIZATION ADMIN. OF TEACHER ED. 2.1 Purposes and Objectives 1.1 2.2 Organizational Pattern 1.5 2.2.1 Board of Control 2.2.2 General Administration 2.2.3 Finance 2.2.4 Extended Services	*Aceto* Broderius	Mel Spurlin	TTT 128
	2.5 Student Participation in Teacher Education Program Evaluation and *3.4* Development	*Harper* Broderius	Area Chairmen Martha Fair, F. Elizabeth Friot, Don Bennett, Oralie McAfee	TTT 17
10:30-Noon	2.6 Faculty in Teacher Education *2.1* 2.6.1 Faculty Competence *2.2* 2.6.2 Part-Time Faculty *2.3* 2.6.3 Service Load *2.4* 2.6.4 Instructional Assignment & Compensation	*Ferguson* *Marksberry*	Mel Spurlin George Brooke	TTT 128
10:30-11:30	5.1 Innovative, Experimental Programs *Eval. 5.1. 5.2*	*Ruff* Adams Ruff	Mary Octigan Eugenia Berger	TTT 108
12:00-1:30	LUNCH	ALL	NONE	Independently

**Aceto ← **Aceto ← **Harper ← **Ferguson ← **Ruff

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE--COMMISSION VISIT SCHEDULE

TIME	TOPIC	TEAM MEMBERS		METRO CONTACT	PLACE OF APPOINTMENT
1:30-3:30	2.7 Facilities & Instructional Materials 4.3 2.7.1 Buildings & Grounds 2.7.2 Library 4.1 2.7.3 Laboratories 4.2 2.7.4 Educational Technology 2.7.5 Curriculum Laboratory 4.2 2.7.6 School-College Relations	Marksberry Aceto	Broderius **Marksberry	Charlene Alexis Marjorie Camaren Barry Barnes Charlene Alexis Mary Octigan	Library TTT 17 TTT 109 Library TTT 110
1:30-3:30	2.3 Admissions, Retention, & Evaluation 3.1 Policies and Practices 1.4 2.3.1 Admission to Teacher Education 2.3.2 Admission to the Profession 2.3.3 Retention 2.3.4 Evaluation	Harper	Ruff **Harper	George Brooks Walter Grunwald	TTT 103
	2.4 Student Personnel Services 3.2 2.4.1 Organized Counseling 2.4.2 Supporting Student Services 2.4.3 Counseling/Advising Students 3.3 2.4.4 Teacher Supply-Demand Data 2.4.5 Student Records 3.1	Harper Ruff	Adams **Harper	F. Elizabeth Friot Mary Octogan Don Bennett	TTT 151
3:30-4:30	Meetings with Teacher Education Students A. Pre-Student Teaching B. Graduate Teaching in Metro Area	Aceto Ferguson Marksberry	Horton Ruff Ohanian Adams		TTT 205
3:30-4:30	Meeting with Other Chairmen	Bezzi Aceto	Broderius		
4:30-4:35	Announcements to Team Members	ALL		NONE	
Thereafter	Writing, Dinner, Writing, Writing	ALL		NONE	Independently
THURSDAY (3-4)					
8:00-9:00	Meeting with Team Chairmen	Bezzi	Broderius	9:00 George Becker	TTT 210
9:00-11:30	Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics) Sec.	Bezzi	Broderius	10:00 Michael Wartell 10:45 Jerry Wilson	TTT 509 TTT 403
8:30-10:00	Business Sec		Ruff	Oscar Schuette	OLY 262
10:00-Noon	English Sec		Ruff	E. Saxe E. Low J. Spradley R. Nadon	WOW 336
1:30-3:00	Spanish Sec		Ruff	J. Esteve O. Carter	AA 202

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE--COMMISSION VISIT SCHEDULE

TIME	TOPIC	TEAM MEMBERS		METRO CONTACT	PLACE OF APPOINTMENT
8:30-10:00	History Sec		Horton	P. Walsh G. Otero C. Angeletti	ZOK 605
10:00-Noon	Art, Sec		Horton	H. Brown R. Mangold	Cherokee 109
1:30-3:00	Speech, Sec		Horton	T. Cook C. Johnson	Gold 219
8:30-10:00	Elementary Education, Elem	*Aceto*	Adams	Mary Octigan	TTT 110
10:00-Noon	Early Childhood Education, Pri	*Ferguson*	Adams	Eugenia Berger	TTT 108
1:30-3:00	Special Education-EMH, El, Sec, K-12	*Harper*	Adams	Martha Fair	TTT 106
8:30-10:00	Industrial Arts, Sec		Ohanian	David Parker	GLN 231
10:00-Noon	Mathematics, Sec		Ohanian	J. Plachy K. Rager E. Hasz	OLY 356
1:30-3:30	Physical Education El, Sec	*Harper*	Ohanian	F. Powell J. Bryant C. Regimbal	PAB 201
Time Arranged	Music, Elem, Sec, K-12	NASM		Jerrald McCollum	Cherokee 344
Thereafter	Writing, Dinner, Writing *ing and Consensus Meeting*	ALL		NONE	Independently
FRIDAY (3-5)					
8:30-Noon	Team Writing, Revisit, Consensus	ALL			
Noon	Lunch. Team Discharged				
1:30-3:30	Exit Interview	*Bezzi* *Aceto*	Broderius Ruff		Forum 1008

SCRIPT - denotes NCATE references or personnel

BLOCK - denotes CDE references or personnel

** *Person assigned primary writing responsibility for NCATE Standards in the areas shown.*